

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Jonathan Michael Kindle, |) | C/A No.: 2:08-cv-02977-GRA-RSC |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER |
| |) | (Written Opinion) |
| |) | |
| SC Department of Corrections; |) | |
| Lt Darryl King; |) | |
| John Carrol; |) | |
| Duard Nunnally; |) | |
| Jordan Williams; |) | |
| Gary Manigault; |) | |
| Alphonzo Lott; |) | |
| Loreado Delacruz; and |) | |
| Pathea Haney, |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |

This matter comes before the Court to review the magistrate's Report and Recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., filed on October 3, 2008. Plaintiff originally filed a complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The magistrate recommends dismissing the South Carolina Department of Corrections from this suit on Eleventh Amendment grounds. This Court agrees.

Plaintiff brings this claim *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *See Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *See Boag v. MacDougall*,

454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.* In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th. Cir. 1983). The plaintiff has not offered any objections.

After a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation, applicable case law, and the record, this Court finds that the magistrate applied sound legal principles to the facts of this case. Therefore, this Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

It is therefore ORDERED that the South Carolina Department of Corrections is dismissed from this case without prejudice or issuance of service.



G. ROSS ANDERSON, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Anderson, South Carolina

November 13, 2008

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Plaintiff has the right to appeal this Order within thirty (30) days from the date of its entry. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, **will waive the right to appeal.**